



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

STANLEY H. KREMEN
4 LENAPE LANE
EAST BRUNSWICK NJ 08816

MAILED
AUG 09 2011
OFFICE OF PETITIONS

In re Application of :
Montanti :
Application No. 10/597,024 : DECISION
Filed/Deposited: 7 July, 2006 :
Attorney Docket No. 51900-MONTANTI-004 :

This is a decision on the papers filed on 28 June, 2011, for revival of an application abandoned due to unintentional delay pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b).

The petition pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b) is **DISMISSED**.

Any request for reconsideration of this decision must be submitted within TWO (2) MONTHS from the mail date of this decision. Extensions of time under 37 C.F.R. §1.136(a) are permitted. The reconsideration request should include a cover letter entitled "Renewed Petition under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b)."

This is **not** a final agency action within the meaning of 5 U.S.C. §704.

As to the Allegations
of Unintentional Delay

The requirements of a grantable petition pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b) are the petition and fee therefor, a reply, a proper statement and/or showing of unintentional delay under the regulation, and, where applicable, a terminal disclaimer and fee

Petitioner does not appear to have satisfied the requirements under the Rule.

Petitioners' attentions always are directed to the guidance in the Commentary at MPEP §711.03(c)(II).

BACKGROUND

The record reflects as follows:

Petitioner failed to reply timely and properly to the final Office action mailed on 29 April, 2010, with reply due absent an extension of time on or before 29 July, 2010.

The application went abandoned by operation of law after midnight 29 July, 2010.

The Office mailed the Notice of Abandonment on 10 November, 2010.

On 28 June, 2011, Petitioner filed, *inter alia*, a petition pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b), with fee, and a statement of unintentional delay, but no proper reply—Petitioner filed an amendment after final, which the Examiner thusfar has refused to enter and Petitioner, as one registered to practice before the Office, knew was not as of right and not a proper reply¹ if it did not *prima facie* place the application in condition for allowance

Petitioners' attentions always are directed to the guidance in the Commentary at MPEP §711.03(c) as to the showing regarding unintentional delay and a petition pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b).

Petitioner has failed to satisfy the requirements under the Rule and discussed above.

The availability of applications and application papers online to applicants/practitioners who diligently associate their Customer Number with the respective application(s) now provides an applicant/practitioner on-demand information as to events/transactions in an application.

Out of an abundance of caution, Petitioners always are reminded that those registered to practice and all others who make representations before the Office **must** inquire into the underlying facts of representations made to the Office and support averments with the appropriate documentation—since all owe to the Office the continuing duty to disclose.²

¹ A proper reply is an amendment *prima facie* placing the application in condition for allowance, a Notice of Appeal, or an RCE (with fee and submission under 37 C.F.R. §1.114). (See: MPEP §711.03(c).)

² See supplement of 17 June, 1999. The Patent and Trademark Office is relying on petitioner's duty of candor and good faith and accepting a statement made by Petitioner. See Changes to Patent Practice and Procedure, 62 Fed. Reg. at 53160 and 53178, 1203 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office at 88 and 103 (responses to comments 64 and 109)(applicant obligated under 37 C.F.R. §10.18 to inquire into the underlying facts and circumstances when providing statements to the Patent and Trademark Office).

STATUTES, REGULATIONS AND ANALYSIS

Congress has authorized the Commissioner to "revive an application if the delay is shown to the satisfaction of the Commissioner to have been "unavoidable." 35 U.S.C. §133 (1994).³ The regulations at 37 C.F.R. §1.137(a) and (b) set forth the requirements for a Petitioner to revive a previously unavoidably or unintentionally, respectively, abandoned application under this congressional grant of authority.

Unintentional delays are those that do not satisfy the very strict statutory and regulatory requirements of unavoidable delay, and also, by definition, are not intentional.⁴))

Again, Petitioner's attentions are directed to the guidance in the Commentary at MPEP §711.03(c).

As to the Allegations of Unintentional Delay

The requirements of a grantable petition pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b) are the petition and fee therefor, a reply, a proper statement and/or showing of unintentional delay under the regulation, and, where applicable, a terminal disclaimer and fee

Petitioner failed to satisfy the requirements under the Rule.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, the petition under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b) is **dismissed**.

Further correspondence with respect to this matter should be addressed as follows:

By Mail: Mail Stop PETITION
 Commissioner for Patents
 P. O. Box 1450
 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

³ 35 U.S.C. §133 provides:

35 U.S.C. §133 Time for prosecuting application.


Upon failure of the applicant to prosecute the application within six months after any action therein, of which notice has been given or mailed to the applicant, or within such shorter time, not less than thirty days, as fixed by the Commissioner in such action, the application shall be regarded as abandoned by the parties thereto, unless it be shown to the satisfaction of the Commissioner that such delay was unavoidable.

⁴ Therefore, by example, an unintentional delay in the reply might occur if the reply and transmittal form are to be prepared for shipment by the US Postal Service, but other pressing matters distract one's attention and the mail is not timely deposited for shipment.

By hand: U. S. Patent and Trademark Office
Customer Service Window, Mail Stop Petitions
Randolph Building
401 Dulany Street
Alexandria, VA 22314

By facsimile: (571) 273-8300
Attn: Office of Petitions

Telephone inquiries regarding this decision may be directed to the undersigned at (571) 272-3214—it is noted, however, that all practice before the Office is in writing (see: 37 C.F.R. §1.2⁵) and the proper authority for action on any matter in this regard are the statutes (35 U.S.C.), regulations (37 C.F.R.) and the commentary on policy (MPEP). Therefore, no telephone discussion may be controlling or considered authority for Petitioner's action(s).


/John J. Gillon, Jr./
John J. Gillon, Jr.
Senior Attorney
Office of Petitions

⁵ The regulations at 37 C.F.R. §1.2 provide:
§1.2 Business to be transacted in writing.

All business with the Patent and Trademark Office should be transacted in writing. The personal attendance of applicants or their attorneys or agents at the Patent and Trademark Office is unnecessary. The action of the Patent and Trademark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.